

# **Report of the Accreditation Re-visit to the University of La Verne**

## **Professional Services Division**

**May 26, 2000**

### **Overview**

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to the University of La Verne that was conducted April 23-26, 2000. This item provides the report of the re-visit team and recommendations regarding four stipulations and the accreditation status.

### **Staff Recommendations**

1. On the basis of the re-visit accreditation team report, staff recommends that the four stipulations placed upon the university by the Committee on Accreditation be removed.
2. Staff recommends that the Committee on Accreditation change the accreditation status of the University of La Verne from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above stipulations.

### **Background Information**

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at the University of La Verne on April 18-22, 1999. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following the following accreditation decision for the University of La Verne and all of its credential programs:  
**ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution must provide evidence of an effective, comprehensive program evaluation system that is implemented across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the university. The evaluation system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in the same ways that the quality management system implemented by the institution assures quality programs across colleges and departments.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has made provisions for all students to be able to access the campus-based infrastructure associated with learning resources. The evidence must indicate how all students, at all sites, are provided equal access to extant resources.
- The institution must provide evidence of a comprehensive system of orientation to professional preparation program information and institutional expectations for each field supervisor/cooperating teacher and to provide for their systematic evaluation.

- If Education Specialist program(s) are to be offered in the future, there must be evidence they are sufficiently resourced to allow meeting all appropriate standards on a continuing basis. This evidence must be provided through the initial program review process now underway.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. A five member re-visit team, all of whom were members of the original team spent two days at the institution in a focused re-visit. Prior to the re-visit at La Verne, three members of the team conducted a schedule of interviews at the Sacramento Center, the Bakersfield Center, and the Long Beach Center. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION  
ACCREDITATION TEAM RE-VISIT REPORT**

**Institution:** University of La Verne

**Dates of Re-Visit:** April 24-26, 2000

**Original  
COA Accreditation**

**Decision:** ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

**Re-visit Team Recommendations**

The team recommends that:

1. The four stipulations from the 1999 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION**.

**Rationale**

Based upon the Institutional Response to the Stipulations, review of supporting evidence and interviews with faculty members, institutional administration, students, graduates, and field supervisors, the team determined that the institution has provided appropriate responses to each of the stipulations and has satisfactorily addressed the standards less than fully met and the concerns identified during the accreditation visit of one year ago. The five members of the re-visit team were members of the original accreditation team of one year ago.

**Team Leader:** Jean Conroy, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Long Beach (Emeritus)

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Linda Smetana**  
Holy Names College

**Carol McAllister**  
Los Alamitos Unified School District

**Basic Credential Program Cluster:**

**James Brown**, Cluster Leader  
Chapman University

**Services Credential Program Cluster**

**Hal Bush**  
Vacaville Unified School District

**Findings on Stipulations**

### **Stipulation #1**

- The institution must provide evidence of an effective, comprehensive program evaluation system that is implemented across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the university. The evaluation system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in the same ways that the quality management system implemented by the institution assures quality programs across colleges and departments.

### **Institutional Response**

*The centerpiece of the program evaluation process at the University of La Verne is the Quality Management System that provides an institution-wide approach to program evaluation. The system includes program evaluation based upon student evaluations and collegial reviews of faculty. In addition, for education programs, the program chairs are required to implement a system that gathers data from graduates of the programs, employers of graduates and site supervisors. These data are collected and analyzed by the program chairs and utilized to maintain/improve the quality of their programs.*

### **Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to the Stipulations prepared by the University of La Verne, interviews with institutional leadership, program leadership, students, graduates and employers, the team confirms that the university has provided evidence that an effective comprehensive evaluation system is in place across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the University. Discussions with supervisors, instructors and students indicate that these evaluations are utilized to assure continuous program improvement.

### **Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #2**

- The institution must provide evidence that it has made provisions for all students to be able to access the campus-based infrastructure associated with learning resources. The evidence must indicate how all students, at all sites, are provided equal access to extant resources.

### **Institutional Response**

*The university has produced a video featuring central campus library staff that explains the process for accessing the resources of the library through the 800 number provided by the institution. Students are shown the video in class during their first term in the program. In the brochure describing programs offered by the institution, students are notified that they need to have internet access in order to fully participate in the program. A sheet that provides information about accessing the library resources and the ERIC and PROQUEST systems is sent as a part of the acceptance package to every new student.*

### **Team Finding**

The team confirmed that the above changes have been made and are being implemented. Students and faculty at three off-campus sites reported that there is no difficulty in accessing the campus-based infrastructure. Students stated that they had seen the video about the central campus library. Most students already have their own computer, with internet access. Others have access to a computer at their school sites.

### **Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #3**

- The institution must provide evidence of a comprehensive system of orientation to professional preparation program information and institutional expectations for each field supervisor/cooperating teacher and to provide for their systematic evaluation.

### **Institutional Response**

*The institution utilizes a variety of procedures to provide university supervisors and cooperating educators with information and expectations for their particular program. As a result of the accreditation review of last year, the institution has reviewed its procedures to insure that there is an orientation of field supervisors/cooperating teachers to their roles. In like manner each program has reviewed its procedures to insure that there is an evaluation of the university supervisor and the site supervisor.*

### **Team Finding**

The institution has implemented several new elements to address this stipulation. The University has provided workshops for university supervisors at all campuses. The workshops have included information regarding university/school district collaboration with a specific focus on communicating program information and institutional expectations. University supervisors in turn have increased their level of collaboration with the field and cooperating teachers. In addition, new written information has been provided by the university for site supervisors regarding program elements and institutional expectations.

### **Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #4**

- If Education Specialist program(s) are to be offered in the future, there must be evidence they are sufficiently resourced to allow meeting all appropriate standards on a continuing basis. This evidence must be provided through the initial program review process now underway.

### **Institutional Response**

*Directly as a result of the accreditation review process of one year ago, the institution has employed an additional .5 faculty member for the Education Specialist Credential program. Program personnel have been involved with “teaching out” the old LH and RS program. Although the institution responded to the concerns addressed by the team, last year, the institution has still not been able to provide a response to the Education Specialist Credential Program Review Panel sufficient to obtain a recommendation for initial program accreditation under the Education Specialist Program Standards. The program has been submitted to the Review Panel for its May meeting. There are currently five students in the “old” program and they will complete that program by June 1, 2000. No students have been admitted to the Education Specialist program since June, 30, 1998. The institution has not advertised the “new” Education Specialist program in its catalog. It will not be advertised until the program has been granted initial accreditation. Formal withdrawal of the program is not necessary, since the program ceases to exist on June 30, 2001. The institution recognizes that the new*

*program will not exist until it receives a satisfactory evaluation from the Education Specialist Review Panel and it is granted initial program accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.*

### **Team Finding**

The team confirms that the institutional response is accurate. The institution is currently developing the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Credential Program.

### **Team Recommendation**

Since the program cannot be initiated until it has received initial accreditation from the Committee on Accreditation, this stipulation is moot. The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

## **Common Standards**

### **Findings on Common Standards Concerns**

The accreditation team articulated concerns related to Common standards, beyond the stipulations mentioned above. Although not required to, the institution addressed each of the concerns.

### **Institutional Response**

For each concern noted, the institution prepared a formal response describing how each concern was addressed during the past year. Following are the team findings related to these concerns.

### **Common Standard 1**

An articulated structure for the development and implementation of professional preparation programs, with multiple variations, has emerged. As the structure continues to develop, the tension between the needs of the multiple units involved in the delivery of the programs requires serious and on-going attention. The institution's commitment to oversight of all professional preparation programs by the appropriate academic units, especially the faculty, needs to be unequivocal.

While identified needs or concerns are addressed and resolved in personal ways by staff in an informal nature, the institution needs to more clearly articulate an institutionalized process that will help to ensure equity and consistency in resolving concerns in ways that does not depend so heavily on the particular individuals involved.

### **Team Findings**

Several actions by the institution have addressed the concerns related to this standard. All credential programs and all education faculty are now a part of the School of Education. In addition, the move from department to school status and the selection of a dean reflect the institution's commitment to oversight of credential programs by the appropriate academic unit. The evaluation system that has been designed and implemented addresses the concerns related to the informal resolution of problems.

### **Common Standard 3**

As enrollment increases, the team is concerned that some faculty may be overextended to the extent that the quality of the programs may be impacted. Another concern is that some programs lack of a systematic process to evaluate university supervisors.

Some students, in some locations, seemed unable to articulate a clear understanding or appreciation of diversity issues and did not appear to attach much importance to them. In other instances, some students expressed concerns about the mismatch between the background and exposure of the instructor and the setting in which they were teaching. Attention to issues of diversity needs to be consistently addressed in the selection of full and part-time faculty and in coursework prescribed for students. The diversity of the university's faculty does not match that of its student body and of many of the communities in which it offers programs. The institution is aware of this discrepancy and is to be commended for having taken some measures to recruit more diverse faculty. An example is the recent establishment, through outside funding of the Minority Faculty Fellowship as an effort to recruit a more diverse faculty. However, to date, it appears that this fellowship has not been utilized by faculty in the Department of Education.

### **Team Findings**

In order to address the overextending of some faculty members the School of Education has added five new positions: a reading instructor, two multiple/single subject instructors, a counseling site supervisor/instructor, and a half-time special education professor. The School of Education has in place a systematic process to evaluate university supervisors.

Since the accreditation visit last April, the Minority Faculty Fellowship is now being used by a member Department of Education faculty to complete doctoral studies. In hiring new faculty, including the five positions described above, the department is attempting to attract full-time faculty who represent ethnic, linguistic or cultural diversity. All credential program chairs have been asked to review diversity issues in all content courses, instructional strategies relevant to delivery of the content, and assessment procedures utilized to determine mastery of the content.

### **Common Standard 6**

The Multiple Subject BCLAD and Single Subject BCLAD programs, at this time, have not yet been approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). However, the University catalog, the Student Teaching Application, as well as advisement materials mention a BCLAD program. Programs should have received CCTC approval before being included in the department materials.

Candidates applying for financial aid report that receipt of financial aid has not occurred in a timely manner. Often applications and supporting information records have been lost or misfiled.

### **Team Findings**

The team confirmed that basic program forms do not mention the BCLAD emphasis. Also, the university catalog has a statement that the BCLAD program is pending approval by the CCTC. To assist in financial aid, the institution has contracted with an outside agency as well as two additional staff members with two more new to begin in July.

## **Multiple and Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential Programs, Including Internship**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that three program standards were met minimally. In addition, the team identified concerns in eight areas, even though it determined that the program standards indicated were met.

### **Institutional Response**

Even though not required to do so, the institution provided responses to each of the three program standards less than fully met, and to each of the concerns identified. Following are the team findings related to those standards and concerns.

#### **Standard 1**

The institution meets the standard minimally as it prepare candidates at multiple sites. The main campus program has an organizational structure that forms a logical sequence among the instructional components, including student teaching, and provides effective coordination of program elements including admission, advisement, candidate assessment and program evaluation. However, the implementation of the program's design, rationale and coordination elements needs to be more consistently implemented at all off-campus sites. Examples of areas in need of attention at off-campus sites include (1) connections between content in course-work and student teaching supervision, (2) program resources, especially access to library reference systems and technology, and (3) consistent and coordinated communication from the institution to candidates, such as the establishment of program expectations.

#### **Team Finding**

The institution fully responded to the concerns identified by the team. Specifically, a series of workshops were implemented that addressed connections between content in course work and student teaching, with a special focus on CLAD components as well as the infusion of frameworks and content standards. The addition of new faculty members has resolved issues related to increased program coordination among sites. This standard is now fully met.

#### **Standard 10**

The Multiple and Single Subject programs do not ensure that all candidates receive field experience with students of diverse ages. This particularly impacts candidates in the Internship program and those on emergency permits.

#### **Team Finding**

Each candidate now is required to verify experiences with students of diverse ages. This standard is now fully met.

#### **Standard 14**

Some current candidates, field supervisors, graduates, and employers report that the program does not fully address principles for effective classroom management. A review of program course syllabi and documentation supports this finding.

#### **Team Finding**



The institution has revised several program elements to include new content and workshops on classroom management. This standard is now fully met.

### **Concern #1**

CLAD emphasis elements are not addressed adequately throughout course work. In addition, very few field supervisors are knowledgeable about ELD/SDAIE methodology and thus may not be able to provide appropriate feedback to assist students.

There appears to be limited acceptance of research on primary language instruction, transference theory and additive bilingualism by some faculty.

### **Team Finding**

The institution developed and implemented a comprehensive initiative, including faculty development workshops and revision of course syllabi that address CLAD content integration and expansion throughout the basic credential programs. This is no longer an area of concern.

### **Concern #2**

Content methodologies for Single Subject disciplines need to be more explicitly addressed. Principals, faculty, candidates, and field supervisors report a concern that there is insufficient attention given to methods for reading in the content areas.

### **Team Finding**

There are now two different reading courses – one for Single Subject and one for Multiple Subject Credential candidates. Insufficient attention to reading in the content areas is no longer a concern.

### **Concern #3**

Some full-time faculty have an excessive workload, including field work, course work, and advisement. “Overloads” are simply too heavy.

### **Team Finding**

The addition of five new faculty positions has helped to alleviate the overloads assumed by faculty.

### **Concern #4**

Insufficient attention is given to state content standards and state content frameworks.

### **Team Finding**

State content standards and frameworks were topics for faculty development workshops that lead to modifications in courses. This is no longer an area of concern.

### **Concern #5**

There is a need for a formalized orientation process for site administrators and master teachers prior to a candidate's field experience.

### **Team Finding**

At all sites, several interventions have been developed and implemented that have addressed the needed communication between the program and K-12 administrators and master teachers. Activities include workshops for university supervisors and K-12 practitioners. This is no longer an area of concern.

### **Concern #6**

There is some confusion as to the roles and responsibilities of main campus and off-site staff. Clarity of the organizational structure needs to be communicated to all support staff, part-time/full time faculty and field supervisors.

### **Team Finding**

Structural and organizational changes are progressing at the institution, including the addition of new faculty and administrators (a new Dean) and the move from an Education Department to a School of Education.

## **Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was met minimally.

### **Institutional Response**

Even though not required to do so, the institution provided a response to the program standard less than fully met.

### **Standard 1**

While the program has a cohesive design, because it is not always clearly articulated at some sites, there is room for improvement. The uneven delivery of information occasionally results in confusion for both students and part-time faculty, who are then unsure of the overall program plan. Improved coordination would result in the sequence of the program being well communicated to all students and faculty.

### **Team Finding**

On-campus students have an interview with the Program Director to determine an individualized sequence of courses. The Reading Program Chairman visits classes to present off-campus students with a student handbook that describes the structure and sequence of the program. Faculty also receive the handbook.

## **Professional Administrative Services Credential Program**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was met minimally.

### **Institutional Response**

Even though not required to do so, the institution provided a response to the program standard less than fully met.

### **Standard 16**

However, Standard 16, which deals with mentor qualifications, is minimally met because there is no written set of criteria or written process for selecting and assessing qualifications of mentors. Neither students nor mentors are able to articulate the role and responsibilities of the mentor.

### **Team Finding**

The Handbook for the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program, which is provided to every student upon entry into the program, now contains a clear indication of the role and responsibilities of the candidate mentor. It also contains a description of the process that should be utilized by the candidate in the selection of a mentor. The handbook also contains information that is shared by the student with the mentor and requires a signature from the mentor verifying understanding of and agreement with the role description and the assigned responsibilities. The standard is now met.

## **Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential Program, including Internship**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was met minimally.

### **Institutional Response**

Even though not required to do so, the institution provided a response to the program standard less than fully met.

### **Standard 20**

Although most of the components of Standard #20 were adequately met, the team found inconsistency across clusters and the main campus in the students' functional knowledge of the variety of mandated assessment instruments used by school districts.

### **Team Finding**

Ed 501 has been revised to include specific objectives that would ensure that students receive knowledge of a variety of mandated assessment instruments used by school districts including the SAT 9, Form T. A discussion of assessment instruments is also included in the introductory counseling class.